

AMENDED IN SENATE JULY 14, 2003  
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MARCH 13, 2003

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2003–04 REGULAR SESSION

**ASSEMBLY BILL**

**No. 274**

**Introduced by Assembly Member Koretz**

February 5, 2003

---

---

An act to add Section 1182.9 to the Labor Code, relating to employment.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 274, as amended, Koretz. Employment.

Under existing law, it is unlawful for a person to retaliate against an employee for exercising his or her employment rights.

This bill would create a rebuttable presumption that an adverse employment action taken within ~~90~~ 60 days after an employee exercises his or her employment rights is retaliatory, unless there is clear and convincing evidence that the employee made up the claim in order to prevent the employer from taking adverse employment action. This presumption would not apply to the criminal penalty for retaliation *and would not apply to a discharge upon the completion of a limited-term employment.*

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: no.  
State-mandated local program: no.

*The people of the State of California do enact as follows:*

1 SECTION 1. Section 1182.9 is added to the Labor Code, to  
2 read:

3 1182.9. (a) Except in the circumstances of a normal seasonal  
4 layoff or a general reduction in force affecting a majority of  
5 employees, if a person discharges an employee or demotes,  
6 suspends, or reduces the hours of work or pay of an employee  
7 within ~~90~~ 60 days after the employee has exercised any of the  
8 rights enumerated in this code, there is a rebuttable presumption  
9 affecting the burden of proof that the person's action was  
10 retaliatory and in violation of Section 98.6, provided, however,  
11 that this presumption shall not apply to the criminal penalty set  
12 forth in subdivision (b) of Section 98.6. The burden of proof under  
13 this subdivision shall be preponderance of the evidence. Nothing  
14 in this section shall be construed to give the Labor Commissioner  
15 concurrent jurisdiction with the Workers' Compensation Appeals  
16 Board with regard to discrimination complaints.

17 (b) The presumption created by this section is ~~inapplicable~~  
18 *rebutted* if it is shown by clear and convincing evidence that the  
19 employee has fabricated a retaliation claim to forestall his or her  
20 employer from taking an adverse employment action.

21 (c) *The presumption created by this section is inapplicable if it*  
22 *is shown that the discharge of the employee was the result of the*  
23 *completion of the daily, weekly, or other limited term of the*  
24 *employment, the employee was hired with the understanding that*  
25 *his or her employment was limited to that term, and the*  
26 *limited-term employment was not designed or created as a*  
27 *limited-term work project for the purpose of avoiding the*  
28 *application of the presumption.*

